DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 388 153 HE 028 696

AUTHOR Maury, Kathleen; And Others
TITLE The Tithing of Higher Education, Out-of-Pocket Spending by Faculty. A Research Report.
PUB DATE [Oct 95]
NOTE 35p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Rank (Professional); *College Faculty; Demography; *Expenditures; Faculty Workload; Higher Education; Operating Expenses; Salaries; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Responsibility; Time Management
IDENTIFIERS Minnesota State College System; *Spending Patterns

ABSTRACT

This study was done to determine how much faculty in the Minnesota State University System spend out of their own pocket to support their work. A survey was distributed to all system faculty (n=2,370) and included demographic and spending pattern items as well as open-ended items. Seven hundred and eleven surveys were returned. Results indicated that faculty averaged well over $4,000 a year on job-related or required spending. In addition, faculty reported contributing large amounts of time on tasks related to and often required under contract. The data showed also that males, females, probationary, and tenured faculty all had very similar spending patterns. Older and younger faculty had similar spending patterns as did faculty from various academic areas. Faculty did not spend differently in the year before tenure nor did spending fall off with rank. The data also suggested that faculty spend their own resources either because it is necessary and/or because they view it as part of their professional commitment. Appended is a case study, "A Day, A Week, a Year in the Life," by David Sebberson, that investigated faculty use of time contending that many faculty members work the equivalent of over 20 percent of time for free. (JB)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED 388 153

**Title:** **A Research Report: The Tithing of Higher Education: Out-of-Pocket Spending by Faculty**

**Authors:**
Dr. Kathleen Maury
Associate Professor of Curriculum and Instruction
Mankato State University Box 52
PO Box 8400
Mankato, MN 56002-8400
E-mail: kmaury@vax1.mankato.msus.edu

Dr. William Olszewski
Professor of Curriculum and Instruction
Mankato State University Box 52
PO Box 8400
Mankato, MN 56002-8400
E-mail: wols@vax1.mankato.msus.edu

Dr. David Sebberson
Associate Professor of English
St. Cloud State University
720 Fourth Avenue
St. Cloud, MN 56301
E-mail: sebberson@tigger.stcloud.msus.edu

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kathleen Maury

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

**Abstract**

The purpose of this research was to determine the out-of-pocket spending by Minnesota State University System faculty to support their work. A survey was distributed to all system faculty (n=2370) and included both demographic and spending pattern items, as well as open-ended items. Results indicate that faculty average well over $4000 a year on job-related/required spending. In addition, faculty reported contributing high amounts of time on tasks related to and often required under contract.

We have chosen to include a case study of a faculty member's use of time. This case study has both quantitative and qualitative aspects. Sebberson's contention is that many, if not most, faculty members are working the equivalent of over 20% of time for free—an astonishing, unrecognized and unrewarded gift on their behalf.

The combination of faculty financial contribution and contribution of hours beyond a 40-hour week makes a powerful statement about their commitment and deserves the notice of their colleagues, administrators, legislators, bargaining units and the public.

HE 027 696



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## PART ONE

## A STUDY OF OUT-OF-POCKET SPENDING BY FACULTY

### Introduction

Although there is a general understanding by the public that huge sums of federal money are entailed in building the educational structures of our country, and although $287 million state dollars are spent annually (MSUS, 1995), there is little understanding by that same public, and even by legislators, of what it is that the faculty of higher education really do. At the levels of elementary and secondary education, people may understand that teachers teach (or are otherwise occupied) in their classrooms all day except for one preparation and lunch. This appears to have become the norm for all teachers at all levels.

(As of July 1, 1995, all post secondary systems in Minnesota were combined into a single system—MnSCU—although bargaining units have not been unified. Thus while MSUS no longer exists as an administrative entity, it will here serve to identify the seven state universities)

The responsibilities of those in higher education, however, are murky to many not intimate with the system. The result of this lack of information has sometimes increased mistrust of the professoriate (who do not spend all day in the classroom) and led to judgments that its members have a rather easy time of it. The ordinary teaching load of faculty in the Minnesota State University System (MSUS) is twelve credits per quarter. This generally means that the professor teaches 12 50-minute periods each week each quarter. There is an understandable, if incorrect, tendency to conclude that faculty members work for 12 hours a week, with a couple hours per day of office hours thrown in. Farther down this line of faulty reasoning lies the conclusion that faculty normally work about five hours per day or 25 or so hours each week. These erroneous conclusions might stem from the common perception that teaching is the primary activity of higher education faculty, as it is at the elementary and secondary levels, along with a bit of advising here and there. But whatever their origin, these perceptions are a long way from the truth of academic activities and responsibilities.

It is not common knowledge, for instance, that teaching is but one of five criteria against which faculty members in MSUS are judged in decisions regarding their tenure, their promotion, and their enduring rounds of

assessment of performance. Faculty members must address these five areas of responsibility when submitting reports of their past performance or plans for their future development: 1) teaching skills; 2) research in one's field; 3) contribution to student growth and development (aside from teaching); 4) the advancement of one's own professional development; and 5) service to the university and the community.

This does not mean, however, that teaching is 20% of a faculty member's duties; it is more than that, for the percentage of time devoted to each of the five criteria is not distributed equally. It varies widely, often according to the particular interests and strengths of each person, and to the needs and expectations of the particular administration at each institution. It is true that there are no specifications about how much of one's time should be devoted to each of the five criteria, other than that the usual teaching load, as mentioned, is 12 class hours per week. But excellent teaching also demands scrupulous preparation for that teaching; and it demands dealing with the outcomes and conditions of that teaching: correcting assignments (some minor, some major); preparation of materials not only for laboratory courses but most others; class size that can vary widely from eight or ten students in a graduate seminar to more than one hundred in a lecture hall; etc. It is the unusual teacher who can spend only one to two additional hours of preparation and homework for each hour of class time.

But the duties of those in higher education have been markedly altered over the years. No longer are state universities in Minnesota seen as the regional and service institutions they once were. Research has played an increasingly important role in faculty life, and decisions for tenure and promotion are based upon the research contributions of the faculty member as never before. The press for publication—the ancient "publish or perish" syndrome—has been felt by every faculty member seeking advancement in rank. (For an irreverent, though often embarrassingly accurate, account of the pitfalls of this criterion for judging effectiveness, see Profscam, by Charles J. Sykes, 1988.) Successive university administrations set themselves to imposing ever more stringent research standards than their predecessors, although without reduction in faculty teaching loads, without additional resources that might make such research both easier and more enjoyable, without diminution of any previous expectations, and without the benefits enjoyed by the major research institutions with whom they are now expected

to compete. As the study reported here shows, this research often comes with a financial price tag: Average annual spending of personal funds for research alone by faculty in 1994 in Minnesota was $355 (see Table 4).

While teaching and research comprise the lion's share of faculty responsibilities and ordinarily consume the greatest amount of faculty time and energy, there are the other three criteria to meet.

"Contribution to student growth and development" is a third of these. The most common form this takes is the advising of students about courses needed, about their majors, about their general state of progress, and sometimes about the personal travails undergone by them at their stage of development. Faculty members are required to spend 10 hours each week for advising, often the most popular faculty find these activities take considerably more time It is not unusual in a larger institution such as Mankato State University for an education professor to have an advisee list of more than 75 names. And students are mightily encouraged to see their advisors regularly! An additional part of this responsibility entails writing letters of reference or recommendation for a significant number of one's primary advisees—those whom the faculty member may have had in class and whom s/he knows better than others.

It is expected that all faculty members customarily spend time on their own professional development, the fourth criterion for advancement. This is not limited to attendance at several or more conferences each year, but also entails professional reading, collaboration with other professional, service to organizations in their fields, and the like. Conscientious persons will have to keep up with the latest developments in their fields as well as with the current technological advances which impinge upon their areas of expertise and provide them with tools for research and for teaching.

The final criterion which faculty must meet is that of making a contribution to the university and to the community. Most serve on multiple committees, with concomitant responsibilities, both within the university (committee work assuming an ever-increasing role in governance and in the rapid change in university life) and within service or other groups such as, Rotary, Kiwanis, environmental or other organizations. Speaking engagements, presentations and active participation in the activities of these groups represent additional outlays of time for faculty members.

The enumeration of the criteria by which faculty performance is judged may still not make it particularly easy for the average person to envision what life is like for the professoriate. In an attempt to give a snapshot of what such performance looks like in the concrete, Part Two of our study deals with time spent by a faculty member. Dr. David Sebberson of St. Cloud State University has kept a daily, indeed an hourly, calendar of his personal workload for the past several years. This case study is instructive to read; Sebberson documents a schedule that will resonate with those who are scrupulous in their work habits.

These five sets of responsibilities, however, demand not only the time and the energy of the staff, but very frequently involve considerable amounts of financial expenditures. Knowing that this was so in our personal instances, we sought to examine with some degree of precision how much faculty members spent, on average, in the calendar year 1994. The expenses we attempted to uncover are solely and completely non-reimbursed; that is, they are expenses borne out-of-pocket by the individual, not by departments or by institutions. We wanted to ascertain average expenditures of <u>personal funds</u> by all 2,370 faculty members within MSUS. We originally termed these expenditures the "hidden costs of education" since they are nowhere else reported, either locally or nationally. Literally nothing was known about these costs before the present study. Our findings, however, have led us to title our report "The Tithing of Higher Education," for our findings reveal that faculty spend over 9% of their income to support their work.

**<u>Research Objective</u>**

The purpose of this research was to gather data about the hidden cost of higher education. Specifically, we studied the out-of-pocket spending of university faculty within the Minnesota the Minnesota State University System. It is common knowledge among higher education faculty that they spend their own money to support their professional responsibilities. However, little information could be found about their specific spending patterns, attitudes about their spending, or even about the specific professional items on which they spend their funds. In addition, there was a second objective. The public at large is, for the most part, unaware that university faculty spend significant amounts of their own money on behalf of one or another of the five criteria against which they are evaluated.

Taxpayers, legislators, and indeed even some higher education employees, appear to think that tax dollars alone support the cost of higher education. We do know that student dollars in the form of tuition contribute substantially to the support of higher education. These researchers believe that there are sources of financial support that are not so obvious, hidden sources of moneys that contribute consequentially to the financial support of higher education.

The purpose of this research, then, was to determine faculty spending patterns, (a hidden and not so obvious cost of education), and to provide information to the public about the out-of-pocket spending of university faculty. We hope that everyone involved might have more accurate knowledge about the actual cost to faculty for participating in the higher education endeavor.

**Methodology**

The authors had done a previous study of out-of-pocket expenditures by K-12 teachers in 1994 (Olszewski and Maury, 1995), and the survey instrument developed at that time provided a framework for one developed specifically for higher education faculty. Preliminary versions were submitted to faculty in the College of Education at Mankato State University and to researchers within the Inter-Faculty Organization (IFO, the teachers' bargaining unit in the Minnesota State University System) for review and change.

With material and logistical assistance of the IFO, survey instruments (Appendix A) were distributed to all faculty members in the seven State Universities in Minnesota: Bemidji, Mankato, Metro, Moorhead, Southwest, St. Cloud and Winona. The Akita, Japan, campus did not participate in the study. Demographic items included sex, age, years of higher education teaching experience, and academic rank. In addition, data were collected about whether or not the respondent had applied for tenure or promotion during the last year, their appointment level (full time, half time, other) and campus location. Also respondents were asked whether theirs was a single family income, and for their total annual salary and specific academic area.

The questionnaire asked respondents to give their best estimate of their expenditures during the last year, where possible using their 1994 income tax itemization of deductions forms as a guide. Respondents were asked to provide their out-of-pocket spending for several categories of items. These

included teaching supplies, professional literature, professional memberships, conferences, research and publication costs, computer software, computer hardware, and Other. The "Other" category was constructed as a fill-in item with prompts such as "non-reimbursed car mileage, postage, long distance calls, equipment" and such. Respondents were also asked to check if they considered their out-of-pocket spending to be elective or required and finally to offer the researchers narrative comments on their feelings about non-reimbursed spending and non-assigned hours worked, etc.

The survey instrument was distributed in time to reach faculty desks about two weeks before the April 15, 1995 income tax deadline, and a cover letter asked respondents to return their questionnaire within ten days of reception. Finally, after the questionnaires were returned, the numerical data were analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). The narrative comments were entered into a word processor and analyzed as qualitative data.

**The Sample**

Surveys were distributed to all MSUS faculty, of which 711 were returned, a 30% return rate.

Table 1 summarizes characteristics of the 711 respondents.

**Table 1**
**The Respondent Pool**

| Sample Description | MSUS Description |
|---|---|
| N = 711 | N = 2370 |
| Male = 454 (64%) | Male = 1504 (64%) |
| Female = 253 (36%) | Female = 861 (36%) |
| Average Age=48 | Unavailable |
| Average Years of Experience = 16 | Unavailable |
| Average Total (not Base) Salary=$46,000 | $43,265 |

Among the respondents were 28 (3%) instructors, 186 (26%) assistant professors, 200 (28%) associate professors, and 298 (42%) full professors. We had anticipated that junior faculty members would be especially interested in

our study and were surprised when that did not turn out to be the case. The reasons for this difference remain conjectural. With the exception of over representation of Full Professors, the sample appears to fairly approximate the system population.

During the past year, 52 were tenured and 136 were promoted. Of the 711 respondents, 58% reported that theirs was not a single family income. Table 2 summarizes the distribution of respondents by campus.

**Table 2**
**Response Rate by Campus**

| | n | % of each campus | % of all respondents | % of MSUS |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bemidji | 70 | 30% | 10% | 9.5% |
| Mankato | 167 | 29% | 24% | 24.5% |
| Metro | 29 | 36% | 4% | 3.3% |
| Moorhead | 96 | 28% | 14% | 15.0% |
| St. Cloud | 230 | 36% | 32% | 27.1% |
| Southwest | 15 | 12% | 2% | 5.6% |
| Winona | 102 | 31% | 14% | 13.5% |
| Missing Cases | 2 | | | |

Our total response rate of 30% was fairly consistent across the various campuses. St. Cloud and Metro State faculty (greater metropolitan campuses) returned a slightly higher (but not significantly so) per cent of questionnaires, and six of the seven campuses responded at rates approximate to their system population.

The sample included a representative cross section of academic areas, as summarized in Table 3.

**Table 3**
**Respondents by Academic Area**

| | Sample n | Sample % | MSUS N | MSUS % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Arts and Humanities | 156 | 22% | 653 | 27.7% |
| Science / Math | 117 | 17% | 467 | 19.8% |
| Social / Behavioral Sciences | 110 | 16% | 325 | 13.8% |
| Business | 88 | 12% | 260 | 11.0% |
| Education | 92 | 13% | 234 | 9.9% |
| Health, Physical Education | 56 | 8% | 234 | 9.9% |
| Library/Media | 24 | 3% | 80 | 3.4% |
| Other | 54 | 8% | 80 | 3.7% |
| Missing Cases | 14 | 2% | | |

Participation in the study was higher for Education and Social and Behavioral Sciences areas than might have been expected.

**Results: The Expenditures**

We made the conventional statistical assumption that an item left blank means something different from a response entered as a zero. An item left blank was taken to mean that the respondent could not make a reasonable estimate and/or had no idea about how much money was spent. We assumed that if the respondent had spent no money in a particular category, the person would have filled in a zero. Therefore the data were analyzed accordingly: if an item was left blank, that item was not calculated as part of n for that item; it was treated as a missing case. Of course, if the respondent did enter a zero on a survey item, a zero was entered into the data file, was calculated as a zero and became part of the n for that item. Using these assumptions, descriptive statistics were calculated for each expenditure item on the questionnaire. Table 4 summarizes the average out-of-pocket spending of persons responding to each item.

**Table 4**
**Average Spending by Respondents Treating Blank Responses as Missing Cases**

| Expenditure Type | Average |
|---|---|
| II-A Teaching Supplies | $165 |
| II-B Professional Literature | $357 |
| II-C Professional Memberships | $309 |
| II-D Conferences | $642 |
| II-E Research/Publication | $355 |
| II-F Computer Software | $274 |
| II-G Computer Hardware | $1373 |
| II-H Other (Miles, Postage, etc.) | $449 |
| Total | $3,924 |
| Total adjusted for known error in item II-C | $4,466 |

We feel that these figures are under-reported. Not only did many respondents say they were giving conservative figures, but one item (Professional Memberships - Item II C ) asked faculty to report how much non-reimbursed money they spent on professional memberships. Full participating dues for the InterFaculty Organization (required by the collectively bargained contract in Minnesota) were $543 in 1994. A glance at the frequency distribution for this item found that 85% of respondents reported a total non-reimbursed professional membership expenditure under $543. This suggests that 85% forgot (or chose not) to report this required, non-reimbursed expense. In all likelihood, $3,924 is a low estimate for average out-of-pocket faculty spending for professional purposes; a truer description of the spending would very likely be closer to $4,466 ($3924 + $543) per year per faculty member.

In order to understand these data, we performed several Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) procedures, several tests for significance of differences, and also several Pearson correlations. Surprisingly, the results of these tests indicated that there was very little variance in the data and no significant

differences. The statistical analyses performed were of no help in explaining these data.

We learned that males and females have very similar out-of-pocket spending patterns, as do probationary faculty and tenured faculty. Older faculty spend similarly when compared with their younger colleagues; and faculty from the various academic areas seem to spend alike. Faculty do not spend differently in the year prior to tenure, nor does spending fall off with rank: full professors spend the same amounts as do instructors, assistants, and associates. There is even no variance within the "Years of Experience" variable. This, of course, means that junior faculty, although they have lower salaries, spend proportionally more of their income than do senior members.

Our data also lead us to conclude that higher education faculty spend their own resources either (or both) because it is necessary and because they view such spending as part of their professional commitment. There seems to be a deep-seated and pervasive acceptance on the part of faculty that spending of personal funds is part and parcel of their chosen career. Nor does there appear to be any identifiable questioning that this should be so: exactly 50% of respondents felt that out-of-pocket spending was required, while the other 50% felt the spending was optional or were uncertain in their response. Expected or not, faculty spend significant amounts of their own money to support their professional activities.

**Results: Narrative Analysis**

The final section of the survey invited comments from respondents, 460 (65%) of whom offered thoughts of one kind or another. We take this high percentage to indicate some considerable interest in our study as well as recognition (as many pointed out) that the study had both limits and shortcomings: 188 (41%) participants (stimulated by our prompt of an estimate of "non-paid, non-credited hours per month spent on research," service, etc.) made reference to the fact that time is a critical element in any assessment of "expenditures." While there was an element of complaint in some of these, most simply pointed out that they spend the greater part of their time doing research, grading papers, reading professional journals, contributing to community service organizations and the like. When read together, the comments about the amount of time spent on their jobs is almost eerily objective and dispassionate: "I work approx. 80 hours/week," "I

probably average 20 hrs over [a 40 hr week]," "Per month: about 40 hours unpaid efforts."

It is not easy to quantify or even estimate these hours with mathematical accuracy, but the general tone of the comments, and the context in which they occur, lead us to conclude that most respondents were speaking of hours beyond the benchmark 40-hour week, which was our intent. As one respondent commented, "Education is not an 8 to 5 job. If I kept track of hours I would have gotten out long ago." Some also pointed out that they use non-teaching summer time to do research, to write, as well as to perform service on committees, etc., without pay. Respondents casually commented on hours spent regularly in evenings and on weekends in course preparation, reading of papers, and even attending to students in crisis. These "extra" hours were most often seen as simply being part of the elected career, not given grudgingly, nor was there much evidence of rancor: "I regularly clock in a 60 hour week, and that includes both summer sessions. But no one forces me to do this—I just love my job." The comments indicate a commitment to academic life and responsibilities that continues unabated and that is singularly devoid of being self-serving. Nonetheless there is a note of disappointment that the hours spent are generally unacknowledged by administration and legislators and unknown to the public. Thus, David Sebberson's case study (Part Two) is an especially valuable contribution toward accounting for and understanding the dimensions of "contributed time."

Sebberson, from St. Cloud State University, eloquently makes the point that faculty appear to be compensated for only about 75% of the time spent on work related activities. Twenty-five percent of their efforts are beyond the benchmark 40-hour week! "A Day, A Week, A Year in the Life" will ring true for anyone who has labored as faculty in any institution of higher education. His work can serve as a model for further research concerning the recording, analyzing and quantifying of "time on task" for educators everywhere.

The next most frequently mentioned concern (125 comments) was about whether the personal costs incurred was expected either by administrators or by themselves as part of their profession. There appears to be some obscurity about requirements of extra time and personal spending. Frequently these are seen as concomitants of being a professional with commitment to excellence. This is the personal, the idealistic, view with such expectations being

personally adopted and managed: "I do it because I love my field..." Yet there is a strong strain indicating that such expectations, if they come from the outside (as requirements for tenure and promotion and other administrative decisions), are easily exploited: the same writer as above continues "...but I also know I would not be promoted if I didn't do it." It almost seems similar to an idealism vs. realism conflict: ideally, these faculty members want to work to the best of their capacities and let the chips fall where they may; really, their salaries and professional advancement do depend on productivity as defined by their contract and interpreted by administrators. Given these circumstances, it is not surprising to find ambivalence in more than a few comments: "Faculty members should look at themselves as professional persons—books, magazines are the tools of our trade....I feel that in order to stay intellectually alive I need to...spend some of my own..dollars....If university funds aren't there, I'll spend my own money rather than die on the vine..." Lofty professionalism ("All of [my educator-family] regard [personal spending] as routine, a hazard of the profession we love!") contends with local realities ("...high expenditures...are necessary because our library does not have adequate materials...").

It seems to us that this gestalt of idealism vs. realism might offer a rich field for mutual investigation by faculty and administration for the purpose of arriving at some satisfying guiding principles or common understandings; otherwise it will remain an underlying but hidden source of discontent, probably for both.

**Conclusions**

In a discussion one faculty member mused that this average expenditure of $4,466 represents 10% of the average total annual income and so amounts to a tithe, as churchgoers everywhere will recognize. It seems as though there is in fact a tithing of higher education faculty, for even if these expenditures are made voluntarily, they are expected by the system.

If we extrapolate our findings to include all 2370 members of MSUS, the figure becomes an annual expenditure by higher education faculty of $10.6 million—a figure large enough to support more than one of the larger institutions, or two or three of the smaller MSUS campuses, for one year, and faculty members will still be contributing somewhere in the area of a quarter of their time for no pay.

**Suggestions for Further Research**

We believe that these data, because of the manner of gathering the data, may contain error. There are ways that future researchers collecting similar data could significantly reduce the error. A random (or volunteer group) of several people could be sought from each campus in the system who might use a designated credit card to charge all professional expenses for an extended period of time. The participant data collectors should be instructed to keep all billing stubs, which could be used to determine very accurate levels of spending. Participants could be cautioned via a prompt list to include not so obvious expenditures and encouraged to collect data over several quarters or more. The credit card billing statements would suggest different areas of business spending, perhaps areas that we neglected to include in this study.

A survey form modeled on the tax form for deductible expenses would be helpful, allowing respondents to go directly to their tax records and record what is there.

It is also clear that faculty spend considerable unrecorded/non-credited amounts of time on professional activities, and that specific research on this very significant contribution to higher education is warranted. More data, collected over a period of at least one academic term, one summer, and one break between academic terms, would shed light on faculty time expenditure, as Sebberson has shown.

Faculty in the Minnesota the Minnesota State University System may or may not be similar to faculty in other systems. Elsewhere there may be more generous or less generous allowances for expenditures in support of professional responsibilities. Data from other state systems would begin to fill in a puzzle whose first piece has been laid by our research.

MSUS faculty spend substantial personal resources to support their professional activities, they donate astonishing amounts of time in their profession, and neither financial nor time expenditures are adequately taken into account in their assessment by administrators or by the public. It is time to reveal the tithing of higher education.

## PART TWO

## A CASE STUDY OF FACULTY USE OF TIME

### A Day, A Week, A Year in the Life

David Sebberson, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of English
St. Cloud State University

**Wednesday, October 12, 1994**

**7:25 a.m.** I catch the bus, organizing my day, anticipating the visits I'll make to classes taught by interns and TAs in our graduate program, looking over appointments, thinking about the three courses I'll be teaching that day.

**8:10 a.m.** I'm sitting in KW's first-year composition (fy-comp) class, watching a film clip from the movie *And Justice for All*. After the clip, she leads the class in a discussion about different rhetorical strategies used by DeNiro in his courtroom scene. Students are engaged, giving examples of different strategies. After the class, we discuss KW's teaching -- what went well, would could've been better. A half-hour later, I head back to my office to prepare for my 10:00 fy-comp class.

**10:00 a.m.** My own fy-comp class is beginning. I've completely redesigned the class this year to accommodate students' needs and focus the course more clearly on the university's general education goals not only of developing academic skills but also of thinking critically and examining human values. Today we'll be discussing an essay I haven't taught before: "Teen Angels and Tart-Tongued Witches" by Susan Faludi.

**11:00 a.m.** MLF's MA thesis committee meets with him to discuss his proposal. While I'm not his thesis director, we've still had a number of meetings to discuss what he's planning on doing. The proposal meeting, the first of two formal meetings each MA candidate has with his or her thesis committee, goes well. The proposal is finalized, and we all look forward to the defense of the finished thesis during Spring Quarter.

**12:00 p.m.** I introduce the discussion leaders for the weekly departmental brown-bag colloquium on issues surrounding the teaching of discourse. As the Director of Composition, I am responsible for organizing these weekly

colloquia, which I have been attending regularly as part of my own professional development since joining the department in 1989. Today's discussion, led by a graduate student and faculty member who have team-taught an introductory literature course focused on environmental issues, examines the topic "Commitment and Reflexivity in Teaching."

**1:05 p.m.** KB, a second-year fy-comp TA has stopped by to discuss a teaching issue, and at 1:45, IV, a first-year TA also stops by to ask a question about teaching. Between these two, S-, one of my fy-comp students, stops by to discuss his writing. Around 2:00, AJ, a colleague from another university, calls to discuss a collaborative project we're planning. We sketch out the tasks we each need to do to put together a conference proposal on the rhetoric and philosophy of economics due in December. Around 3:00, EK, a TA, stops by to discuss a rather complex issue about possibly threatening behavior by one of her students. We discuss different strategies, including meeting with the Assistant Vice-President for Student Life.

**4:00 p.m.** The one-credit graduate practicum on teaching college English holds its weekly meeting. All graduate TAs teaching fy-comp are required to register for this 600-level course focusing not only on day-to-day class-room issues, but also on professional development. Thus through the course of a year, we may discuss strategies for building vitae, using the classroom as a source for research, making conference presentations as well as critiquing textbooks, discussing how to use small groups effectively, or holding calibrating sessions on grading student writing.

**5:05 p.m.** I'm standing in line at Hardee's in the student center, rereading material for tonight's class. I continue to read while eating until I'm joined by DJ, a colleague from Speech Communications. She is past chair of the university-wide Professional Improvement Committee (PIC), of which I am currently co-chair. We discuss an emerging controversy over the professional review of sabbatical proposals, which falls under the purview of the PIC! The controversy exists between those who wish sabbaticals to be awarded solely on the basis of seniority and administrators' discretion and those who believe that peer review by fellow professionals should play a part in those sabbaticals that are not contractually mandated. We arrange a meeting to discuss the issue further.

**6:00 p.m.** My graduate seminar on the theory and practice of teaching college composition is beginning. A four-credit graduate seminar that meets

once a week, it will last, with one short break spent in talking with students, until 9:30. After class, I spend a half-hour organizing course material, including the assignments that students have submitted.

**10:00 p.m.** I stand outside my office building, waiting for the cab, hoping that I won't get the driver who's a part-time student and needs some advice on which comp class to take.

Is every day a 14-hour day? No, of course not. But neither is it an unusual day. Every quarter that I teach a night class, which in my current assignment as Director of Composition is typically two out of three quarters a year, I work a 12-14 hour day once a week. While every day may not be a 14-hour day, every day is virtually non-stop, covering everything from class prep, to meeting with TAs, to working on program development to even doing a little scholarly work. Sometimes, I even get to read a little. Remarkable thing for an English professor! With one or two exceptions per quarter, lunch is eating a sandwich while grading papers or meeting with students, or doing whatever work is at hand.

**It's Been a Quiet Week in Lake Wobegon**

Followers of Garrison Keillor may appreciate that my institution, St. Cloud State University, exists in fact in the same county as the little town that time forgot exists in myth. Indeed, time is too much with us as I quickly learned, paradoxically perhaps, I had too little of it. Starting with the break between Winter and Spring Quarters, 1990, during my first year as a tenure-track faculty member, I have kept a desk diary of the hours I spend each week on all the work I do to meet my contractual obligations, keep my job, and meet expectations for promotion and tenure. During the summer of 1991, the diaries became increasingly specific as I not only kept track of appointments and total hours, but also began itemizing my activities, usually down to quarter hour increments. Informally kept with no strict protocols or formal categories, the diaries are nonetheless reasonably accurate over time and detailed enough to offer a snapshot of one professor's work for a year according to the five contractual categories governing the work of Minnesota State University faculty: teaching, scholarly or creative work, continuing study and preparation, student growth and development, and service to the university and community.

Like those in Lake Wobegon whose children are all above average, I may be tempted to boast that my work weeks are above average too, at least when compared to a 40-hour norm. But, unfortunately for all of us, that is not the case. My experience has in fact been pretty much average. According to a survey conducted by the U.S. Department of Education and cited by AAUP Committee C's report in the January-February 1994 issue of *Academe*, faculty in all colleges and universities, ranging from the 2-year community college to the research institution, average 53 hours per week ("The Work of Faculty: Expectations, Priorities, and Rewards" 39). In comprehensive universities like SCSU, the national average is 52 hours per week (39). During 1994, the calendar year I am focusing on here, I worked an average of about 49 hours per week during regular academic sessions when I was being paid to work, plus about 31 hours per week during winter and quarter breaks when I was not being paid to work. Factoring in work during breaks without pay, my average for 1994 was a little over 52 hours per week, identical to the national average for comprehensive institutions like mine.[1] The week of October 10, 1994, for example, which included the 14-hour day I described above, turns out to have been more or less an average one, where I worked 50 hours.

**Two Years Before the Mast.... But In Only Eighteen Months?!?**

While the number of hours I work per week tends to be average, my appointment is not; I need to say a few words about it. As Director of Composition, my appointment letter explicitly states that one third of my time is administrative and two thirds is instructional. For most SCSU faculty, appointments are entirely instructional. Because my job requires that I sit on certain departmental committees, organize weekly colloquia, run the composition test-out program, and maintain a resource collection for composition instructors, my hours under service tend to be higher than those with a purely instructional appointment.

How do I spend my time in the course of a year? And how much of my time do I donate to the state as free labor?

---

[1] I have not factored in time for summer, because summer 1994 has proved to be unique and thus not reasonably representational: I taught in the university's study abroad program. While I averaged 40 hours per week teaching two 4-credit courses in an 8-week quarter, I was paid at a reduced rate. What is a remarkable coincidence, however, is that during both my regular appointment and my special summer appointment, I was paid for only about 75% of the time I worked. During the school year I was paid for 40 hours a week, but worked for 52. During the summer (using my base pay prorated for 8 weeks), I was paid for 30 hours a week but worked 40.

To answer these questions I assumed, first, a 40-hour work week. This assumption is reasonable on several counts. First, it is a cultural norm (although for too many Americans it is becoming a cultural myth). Second, the State of Minnesota premises a 40-hour week when calculating sick leave and personal leave as applied to Minnesota State University faculty. Third, the article of the contract outlining faculty workload speaks not only in terms of course credits but also in terms of "hours" and "balance of the faculty workload," language that makes sense only if a norm such as the 40-hour week is followed. Next, I assumed that my work should be analyzable according to the categories I listed above: teaching, scholarly or creative work, continuing study and preparation, student growth and development, and service. Most of the work I do is easily categorizable, although I need to explain the principles I used to assign some tasks to one category, some to another.

Under teaching I included not only class time, but also time spent preparing for class, meeting with students to discuss their course work, and evaluating their work.

Under continuing study and preparation I thus did not include reading that I do for specific class assignments but did include the reading I do when I'm exploring material to develop a new class or am reading generally in my academic and scholarly areas. Also under continuing study and preparation I included time spent in conference sessions, reading journal articles, and reading e-mail postings on professional and academic listservs. Contrary to the assumptions of the cynical, I did not count time thinking great thoughts when I'm standing in the shower or on my way to work. Nor did I count the time I spend reading mysteries, or reading the op ed pages, or attending plays at the Guthrie though I teach courses drawing materials from popular culture, applied rhetoric, and literature and semiotics.

Time spent reading for papers, articles, and reviews that I'm writing was categorized under scholarly and creative work (though it contributes to my continuing preparation). The time I spend proposing, writing, and delivering papers, articles, and reviews I categorized, obviously, under scholarly work. Also categorized under scholarly work was reviewing colleagues' work, either informally or formally as the assistant editor of a scholarly journal.

Under student growth and development I included time spent on my one-on-one work with TAs, visits to their classes and follow-up conversations,

evaluations of their teaching, reviews of their teaching materials and student evaluations, and letters of recommendation. I also included time spent advising undergraduates about taking first-year composition courses and testing out of composition and reviewing materials by transfer students petitioning to waive the university's composition requirement. Finally, I included time spent addressing student complaints and cases of plagiarism.

Under service to the university and community I included all committee work and administrative tasks. This category also became the one where accounted for were the myriad tasks that go unnoticed by legislators, the public, and our students but are essential to the continuing renewal of curricula and programs and the ongoing vitality of the university: sessions on assessment, for example, or meetings both formal and informal to develop new degree emphases attuned to careers and professional development, or conversations leading to grant proposals for new course initiatives -- the sort of invisible work that makes education timely as well as timeless, academic fields fertile rather than sterile, the university environment dynamic rather than static -- a buzzing, teeming, hustling, hectic, noisy, seeking, seething place of energy rather than some silent hallowed grove or tomb-like ivory tower. This hum of the university is the hum of hours spent by faculty working six days per week and more while getting paid for five. So back to the questions I posed above: How do I spend my time in the course of a year? And how much of my time do I donate to the state as free labor? Table 1, "The Year in Review -- 1994," gives an overview of how I spent my time during regular academic terms and their associated breaks, how many hours I was paid to work and how much time I worked for free. The table does not account for Summer Quarter 94, which was a unique case (see fn 1, p 5).

Table 1: The Year in Review -- 1994

| | Tching Hours | Scholship Hours | Prep & Study Hours | Student Dev Hours | Service Hours | Total Hours | Paid Hours | Unpaid Hours |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Win 94 | 130.75 | 6.25 | 41.75 | 66.50 | 174.25 | 419.50 | 344.00 | 75.50 |
| Break | 5.00 | 0.00 | 37.25 | 0.75 | 0.50 | 43.50 | 0.00 | 43.50 |
| Sp 94 | 76.75 | 73.50 | 128.00 | 75.25 | 178.00 | 531.50 | 440.00 | 91.50 |
| Prep Wk. | 10.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 9.00 | 21.00 | 0.00 | 21.00 |
| Fall 94 | 247.25 | 60.50 | 52.00 | 90.75 | 175.00 | 625.50 | 496.00 | 129.50 |
| Break | 15.00 | 4.00 | 8.00 | 0.00 | 7.50 | 34.50 | 0.00 | 34.50 |
| Win 95 | 50.25 | 0.00 | 3.00 | 34.50 | 41.25 | 129.00 | 120.00 | 9.00 |
| Break | 2.50 | 0.00 | 3.00 | 13.00 | 7.00 | 25.50 | 0.00 | 25.50 |
| Total | 537.50 | 145.25 | 273.00 | 281.75 | 592.50 | 1830.00 | 1400.00 | 430.00 |
| % | 30% | 8% | 15% | 15% | 32% | 100% | -- | -- |

As Table 1 indicates, during 1994 I donated 430 hours of time to students and the state of Minnesota fulfilling my five contractual obligations. The dollar value of that time, according to where I fall in the salary scale, is $11,289.26. Given that all 430 hours were in fact overtime, if the dollar

amount were calculated at the business norm of time-and-a-half, the dollar value would be $16,933.89.

**Read All About It! Average State University Faculty Member Donates Over $12,000 A Year to Minnesota!**

I keep looking for that headline but never see it. Yet given an average faculty salary of $40,000 (a rough figure often used by those speaking about salaries system wide) and an average work week of 52 hours, faculty are in effect donating an average of $12,797.62 of free labor a year to further higher education. Since the mass media seem to be typically in the business of perpetuating popular myths rather than breaking them, I probably won't be seeing my dream headline for a while. But I would like to break a few myths here.

**Myth 1: Faculty *Work* Only 12 Hours a Week.** Need I say more? Perhaps. Of the few university faculty who made the news in Minnesota last year, the one that tends to stick in people's minds is a professor who took a second university appointment in North Carolina while retaining his tenured position at the University of Minnesota. Like a Willie Horton of Academe or a Welfare-Queen-in-a-Cadillac, the image of this one professor came to be considered to a degree as representative, symptomatic of a professoriate grown cynical about its teaching and fat in the luxury of working only a few hours a week. It never seemed to occur to anyone why this professor was in the news: he was an atypical case; moreover, he didn't beat the system by keeping two appointments. Believers in this myth like to use crude business analogies: the professor as plumber, the teacher as assembly line worker, the 40-hour week as something that needs to be imposed on faculty. But my plumber costs $30.00 an hour; I cost the state of Minnesota $25.81 an hour for the first part of 1994, $26.68 for the last part. And when was the last time an assembly-line worker worked over two and a half months for free? And like most of my colleagues, I would love to have my work week cut by about a quarter and limited to 40 hours.

Associated with this myth is the notion that sabbatical is paid vacation for a year. Of course it's not; it's a time when faculty work on their scholarship and professional development, which in turn enriches the learning environment of the university. But even if we assume the business notion of comp time, sabbaticals are a cheap deal. For faculty at Minnesota State

Universities, full-year sabbaticals are guaranteed every 10-years (faculty may apply for sabbaticals every six years, but they aren't guaranteed). Also, an average quarter is 448 hours or 56 duty days. Thus in 1994 my donated time of 430 hours was just 2 days and 2 hours shy of an entire quarter. At that rate the state could guarantee me a sabbatical after every four years instead of every ten and still get almost a year's worth of free labor for every four years that I taught.

**Myth 2: Faculty *Teach* Only 12 Hours a Week**. A favorite position taken by those who admit that faculty may work more than 12 hours a week but who believe faculty spend too little of their time teaching or working with students. Table 2, "Time Spent Teaching and Working with Students," shows the time I spent on average each week during the regular academic terms on my teaching and working on student growth and development.

**Table 2: Time Spent Teaching and Working With Students**

| Term | Tching Load Cr Hrs | Avg. Weekly Hours Teaching | Avg. Weekly Hours Student Dev. | Tot. Avg. Hrs Weekly Teaching & Student Dev. | % of Time Teaching for Quarter | % of Time Student Dev for Quarter | Total % of Time Teaching & Student Dev for Quarter |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Win94 | 9 | 15.20 | 7.73 | 22.93 | 31% | 16% | 47% |
| Sp94 | 5 | 6.97 | 6.84 | 13.81 | 14% | 14% | 28% |
| Fall94 | 9 | 19.93 | 7.32 | 27.25 | 39% | 14% | 53% |
| Win95 | 9 | 16.75 | 11.50 | 28.25 | 39% | 27% | 66% |

Those quarters that I teach "only" 9 hours a week, I average about 26.25 hours a week on my teaching and working with students, or about 55 percent of my time for the term. Even when I teach "only" 5 hours a week I spend almost 14 hours a week on my teaching and working with students or on their behalf in tasks such as writing evaluations and letters of recommendation. There's a rough ratio here: for every hour I spend in the classroom, I spend almost 2 hours outside the classroom working on my teaching or on student growth and development. Keep in mind that I have

one third reassigned time for administrative duties. The typical teaching load for State University faculty is 12 hours a week, not 9. Assuming that my rough ratio would remain constant, I would be spending in the neighborhood of 30-35 hours a week on teaching and student development. This brings us to the next myth.

**Myth 3: It's Not that Faculty Don't Work Hard; They Need to Work Smarter.**

This was a myth floating around the Minnesota state legisiature last year during budget debates. Most people outside the academy seem willing to accept this myth if they're willing to accept that faculty work hard at all. There are two primary variations of this myth:

1) Faculty spend too much time sitting around reading or doing research.
2) Faculty waste too much time on committee work.

Too much time doing research! As Table 1 shows, I spent only 8 percent of my time over the course of a year doing scholarly work, and only 15 percent on continuing study and preparation. Together, these two categories accounted for only 23 percent of my time in 1994. Putting it another way, I spent almost twice as much time on teaching and student development (43 percent) as I did on reading and doing research. Moreover, unlike pundits and politicos, faculty have a contractual obligation -- as well as professional and ethical ones -- not to grow ignorant. It is only by remaining active learners ourselves that we can in turn make an active learning environment for our students. One of my areas of research, for example, the rhetoric of economics, may seem arcane, and my attending economics conferences in January 1994 and April 1994 and a conference on integrative studies in October 1994 may seem like little more than mid-term get-a-ways. But these "self-indulgences" contributed to teaching when they enabled me to apply for a grant to develop and deliver a team-taught, interdisciplinary course with an economics professor, a course that we began teaching in December 1994 as part of a system-wide initiative to improve the quality of undergraduate education.

As for all that useless committee work -- since one third of my time was administrative and since I spent 32 percent of my time under the category of service, the proportion of work under this category in relation to the others was about right. "But," the cynical could say, "you shouldn't have been

assigned so much administrative time in the first place. Why aren't you in the classroom where you belong?" That would be a reasonable point if service -- i.e. administrative and committee work -- failed to serve. But it doesn't fail to serve. Those weekly colloquia I organize, for example, contribute to maintaining a dynamic teaching environment. The department committees that I served on similarly contribute to maintaining a healthy educational environment. 1994 was similar to other years. It was through committee work I participated in that we reviewed applications for our graduate assistantship program, ensuring that we would select candidates with high potential for succeeding not only as graduate students but also with potential for succeeding in our program of teacher and professional development. It was through committee work that we assessed one of our composition courses that led to revalidating it as a viable part of the university's general education program. It was through committee work that we began developing new emphases in our graduate program, emphases that explicitly meet the needs of students who desire professionally oriented education for college-level teaching and writing in the workplace. All were initiatives that directly benefited students.

**A Year of Living Dangerously**

Most colleges and universities have mission statements focused on teaching, producing or applying knowledge, and sustaining viable service to those parts of the society that the institutions consider their constituents. To complement the missions of colleges and universities, most faculty work under contracts that outline expectations of teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, and service. It is through scholarly and creative work, continuing study and preparation, that faculty renew their own knowledge, keeping them viable as teachers in a changing world. And it is through administrative and committee work that faculty renew the institutions of higher learning, keeping them viable and renewing them to meet the changing needs of both students and society.

Overall, 1994 was an average one for me, compared to the rest of the profession, in terms of balancing teaching, scholarship (a term for me comprising research, creative or scholarly work, and professional development) and service (which I use to include administrative and other work and community service). According to that same Department of

Education survey cited earlier, full-time regular faculty at 4-year colleges and universities spend on average a little over half their time on teaching, a little less than a quarter of their time on scholarship, and right at a quarter of their time on service (Committee C, 40). At public comprehensive universities, faculty spend about 62 percent of their time teaching, about 15 percent doing scholarly work, and about 22 percent serving their institutions and communities (Committee C, 40). Given my instructional and administrative mix, along with heavy involvement in an MA program tied directly to my position as Director of Composition, my workload looks more typical of a public doctoral institution than of either a public comprehensive or public research institution, but typical nonetheless: At public doctoral institutions faculty spend 47 percent of their time teaching where I spent 45 percent; they spend 27 percent of their time on scholarship where I spent 23 percent; they spend 26 percent of their time on service where I spent 32 percent.

While attacks on faculty work are troubling enough, what I find even more troubling --even dangerous -- is that direct attacks on faculty labor are even more profoundly attacks on the missions of colleges and universities. How long can I sustain donating 430 hours of free time to my institution and continue contributing to its mission? Should I have reduced that figure in 1994 by cutting out the 418 hours I spent on scholarly work and continuing study and preparation? But if I had, then how would I have contributed to that part of my institution's mission dedicated to the production and application of knowledge? Should I have cut my 592.5 hours of administrative work and service to 162 hours? But what would have happened to those weekly department colloquia, or that assessment of our first-year composition course, or the development of those new MA emphases? Or how about this mix: I could have cut the 145.25 hours I spent doing scholarly work and the 281.75 hours I spent on student development, and I could have become a writing teacher who no longer wrote and a professor who refused to acknowledge his students outside of class. How well would this serve our students, the business community, the state, or the region? How well would this approach help me contribute to my university's mission to serve all these constituents and interests?

What is dangerous about my remarkable 14-hour day, my remarkable 52-hour week, my remarkable year of donating (unremarked) $11,289.26 of labor to the students and state of Minnesota is that my day, my week, and my year

were not remarkable at all. They were not at all particularly strong, good-looking, or above average like those folks in Lake Wobegon. But these average days, weeks, and years are dangerous, and they are dangerous because their relentlessly typical averageness are burning out the core missions of higher education.

## References

MSUS (July1, 1995). Minnesota State University System Financial Report, Fiscal Year 1995.

Nelson, F. Howard (1991). International comparison of public spending on education. American Federation of Teachers. Washington, D.C.

Olszewski, W. and Maury, K. (1995, in press). "If it helps the kids": What teachers spend for their students. Phi Delta Kappan.

Sykes, Charles J. (1988). Profscam: Professors and the demise of higher education. New York: St. Martin's Press.

United States Department of Education. (1994). The work of faculty: Expectations, priorities, and rewards. In Academe. (Jan-Feb, 1994), p. 39ff. Washington; US Department of Education.

# APPENDIX A

The Survey Instrument

Spring, 1995

Dear Colleague:

This information will help us determine the hidden costs of education for faculty members in the State University System. Please provide information about your work-related but non-reimbursed spending. Thank you for your participation.

## I. ABOUT YOU

A. Male _____ Female _____
B. Age _____
C. Years you have taught at the university level:_____
D. Rank: Instruc. _____ ; Assist. _____ ; Assoc. _____ ; Full _____ ; Other _____
E. During the past year were you: Tenured _____; Promoted_____
F. Appointment: Full Time _____; Half Time _____; Other _____
G. Your campus: _____
H. Is yours a single family income? Yes _____ No_____
I. Your total (not base) salary for last year (to the nearest hundred): $_____
J. Your Area: Arts&Humanities _____ Sciences/Math _____ Education _____ Health/P.E. _____
Library Media _____ Social/Behavioral _____ Business _____Other (specify) _____

## II. ABOUT YOUR SPENDING

How much of your own money (non-reimbursed) will you have spent this past year on the following ? (Use 1994 income tax form, or estimate if necessary).

A. Teaching supplies (items to teach with, e.g., handouts, incentives, etc.):$_____
B. Professional literature (books, journals, newsletters, etc. ): _____
C. Professional memberships (dues, fees, etc.): _____
D. Conferences (non-reimbursed costs of all attended; e.g., registration, taxi, parking, meals, travel, materials, etc.): _____
E. Research/Publication costs (paper, copying, data collection and entry, analysis costs, etc.): _____
F. Computer software used for professional purposes (disks, videodisks, CD-ROMs, etc.): _____
G. Computer hardware used for professional purposes: (computer, fax, modem, etc.) _____
H. Other (such as non-reimbursed car miles, postage, long distance calls, equipment, etc.). Please describe.

_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____

I. Do you consider personal spending in general as something required _____ or elective _____ for promotion and/or tenure?

## III. ABOUT YOUR FEELINGS ON THIS MATTER

Any thoughts, feelings or experiences you can share with us on this matter will be greatly appreciated (e.g., ., estimate of non-paid, non-credited hours per month spent on research or service; other ideas).

_____
_____
_____
_____

Use the back of this form, if more space is needed. Thank you!

Kathleen Maury
William Olszewski

# APPENDIX B

Composite Figures on the Survey Form

## Composite Figures

Response Rate: N = 711/2370 = 30%  IFO Members: 634 = 89%;  Fair Share: 62 = 9%

I. THE DEMOGRAPHICS

A. Male 454 = 64%  Female 253 = 36%

[SUS: Male = 63.6%; Female = 36.4%]

B. Age  x = 48 (range: 28-70)

C. Years you have taught at the university level: x = 16 (range: 1-43)

D. Rank: Instruc. 28 = 4% Assist. 186 = 26% Assoc. 200 = 28% Full 298 = 42% ;

Other 1 = 0%

[SUS: Instr = 8.7%; Assist = 27.4%; Assoc = 22.9%; Full = 36.3%; Other = 4.5%]

E. During the past year were you : Tenured 52 = 7% Promoted 136 = 19%

F. Appointment: Full Time 668 = 94% ; Half Time 7 = 1% ; Other 18 = 3%

G. Campus: Bemidji 70 = 10%; Mankato 167 = 24%; Metropolitan 29 = 4%; Moorhead 96 = 14%; St. Cloud 230 = 32%; Southwest 15 = 2%; Winona 102 = 14% (missing cases = 2)

[SUS: Bem = 9.5%; Man = 24.5%; Met = 3.3%; Mrh = 15%; StC = 27.1%; Sw = 5.6%; Win = 13.5%]

H: Is your a single family income? Yes 290 = 41% ; No 410 = 58%

I. Your total (not base) salary for last year (to nearest hundred): Inst x = $26,211; Assist x = $38,555; Assoc x = $44,864; Full x = $54,398; X = $46,612

[SUS: X = $43, 265]

J. Your Area: Arts&Humanities 22%; Sciences/Math 17%; Education 13% ; Health 8% ; Business 12%; Library Media 3%; Social/Behavioral 16%; Other 8%

[SUS: A&H = 27.7%; Sci/Math = 19.8%; Educ = 9.9; Hlth 9.9%; Bus = 11%; LibM = 3.4%; Soc/Beh = 13.8%; Other = 4.5%]

## II. THE SPENDING

Money (non-reimbursed) spent during 1994:

A. Teaching supplies (Items to teach with, e.g., handouts, incentives, etc): x = $165

B. Professional literature (books, journals, newsletters, etc. ): x = $327

C. Professional memberships (Dues, fees, etc): x = $309

D. Conferences (Non-reimbursed costs of all attended; e.g., registration, taxi, parking, meals, travel, materials, etc.): x = $643

E. Research/Publication costs (paper, copying, data collection and entry, analysis cost, etc.): x = $355

F. Computer software used for professional purposes (programs, videodisks, CD ROMS, etc) x = $274

G. Computer hardware used for professional purposes: (computer, modem, etc.; x = $1,373

H. Other non-reimbursed expenses (such as car miles, postage, long distance calls, equipment, etc). Please describe.

_____ x = $449

I. Do you consider this spending as required (51%) or elective (35%)? (15% missing)

**Average Total Expenditures** X = $3,923*

**Average Adjusted for Known Error in Item II-C** X = $4,466

* When averages A-H are totaled, this amount is $3895; when computer totals and averages every A-H response, the average total expenditures is as given: $3923. We have elected to use the computer average as less subject to error.

## III. THE COMMENTS

460 (65%) of respondents wrote comments in this section.

Kathleen Maury
William Olszewski